

2433. Misbranding of Rosex Vaginal Protective. U. S. v. 23 Cartons * * *.
(F. D. C. No. 24484. Sample No. 27249-K.)

LIBEL FILED: March 18, 1948, Western District of Tennessee.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about October 17, 1947, by Rosex Laboratories, from St. Louis, Mo.

PRODUCT: 23 cartons each containing a nozzle and one tube of *Rosex Vaginal Protective* at Memphis, Tenn. The label stated that the product was composed of glycerin, oxyquinoline, and boric acid in a suitable base.

LABEL, IN PART: "ROSEX A Superior Vaginal Protective Net Weight 2 Oz."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement "A Superior Vaginal Protective" was false and misleading, since the article would not protect against the various disease conditions of the vagina.

DISPOSITION: April 21, 1948. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

2434. Misbranding of adhesive bandages. U. S. v. 238 Cartons * * *.
(F. D. C. No. 24308. Sample No. 10276-K.)

LIBEL FILED: January 29, 1948, Eastern District of New York.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about October 20 and 29, 1947, by Johnson & Johnson, from New Brunswick, N. J.

PRODUCT: 238 cartons, each containing 12 retail packages, of *adhesive bandages* at Brooklyn, N. Y. Each retail package contained 36 assorted *adhesive bandages*.

LABEL, IN PART: (Packages) "Tyro-thri-cin Pad Antiseptic Band-Aid Sterile Adhesive Bandage."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statements in the labeling, "Antiseptic," "Tyro-thri-cin * * * an organic antiseptic which is derived by natural processes," and "Kills—Instead of Merely Checking Germ Growth," were false and misleading as applied to the article, which was neither antiseptic nor germicidal.

DISPOSITION: March 22, 1948. Johnson & Johnson, claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

2435. Misbranding of Dr. Johnson's Private Formulas Nos. 1, 4, and 5, laxative tablets, and rectal pipes. U. S. v. Dr. O. A. Johnson Rectal Clinic. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 24237. Sample No. 99701-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: On or about March 5, 1948, Western District of Missouri, against the Dr. O. A. Johnson Rectal Clinic, a corporation, Kansas City, Mo.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about July 30, 1947, from the State of Missouri into the State of Oklahoma.

PRODUCT: A combination treatment consisting of 2 tubes of *Formula No. 1*, 1 tube of *Formula No. 4*, 1 tube of *Formula No. 5*, 1 box of *laxative tablets*, and 3 *rectal pipes*.

LABEL, IN PART: "Dr. Johnson's Private Formula No. 1. Analgesic—Anti-Pruitic Active Ingredients—Menthol Synthetic, Camphor, Oil Eucalyptus, Carbolic Acid"; "Dr. O. A. Johnson's Private Formula No. 4 Astringent—Local Hemostatic Active Ingredients—Tannic Acid in Methylene Blue and Petrolatum Base"; "Dr. O. A. Johnson's Private Formula No. 5 Astringent—Emollient Active Ingredients: 6½% Alcohol by Volume. Calendula Off (Marigold), Mangifera Ind (Mango Gum), Hamamelis, (Witch Hazel), Ichthy-mall"; and "Laxative Tablets. Each Tablet Contains: Extract Belladonna . . . ⅛ grain (¼ grain total Alkaloids) Ext. Cascara Sagrada, Oleoresin Ginger, Aloin, Podophyllin."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the labeling of the article, which included a circular entitled "Good News," leaflets entitled "The Best Proof of All" and "Directions for using," and a number of letters addressed to the consignee of the article, contained statements which were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the article when used in accordance with the directions in the labeling would be an adequate treatment for piles; that it would be efficacious in the cure, mitigation, and treatment of rectal pain, soreness and bleeding of the rectum, bleeding and protruding piles, "Blind Piles," ulcerated rectum, and other rectal troubles;

and that it would be efficacious in the prevention of serious conditions resulting from piles. The article when used in accordance with the directions in the labeling would not be an adequate treatment for piles, and it would not be efficacious for the purposes represented.

DISPOSITION: March 5, 1948. A plea of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

2436. Misbranding of Two Way Stretched Plastic Film. U. S. v. Reed Laboratories, Inc., and Exa Glenn Reed. Pleas of nolo contendere. Fine of \$250 and costs. (F. D. C. No. 23248. Sample No. 70819-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: November 12, 1947, Northern District of Ohio, against Reed Laboratories, Inc., Akron, Ohio, and Exa Glenn Reed, president.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about December 9, 1946, from the State of Ohio into the State of California.

PRODUCT: Examination showed that the product consisted of a thin transparent plastic-like film rolled on a cardboard cylinder.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in a circular entitled "A Preliminary Report on Q Energy," which was enclosed with the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious to heal simple injuries four or five times faster than normal, to heal sores which had not responded to any other form of treatment, and to heal varicose ulcers, abdominal incisions, serious burns and sunburns, amputations, corns, and callouses; that it would be efficacious to reduce swellings and growths and varicose veins, to make wens and fatty tumors disappear, and to reduce and eliminate swellings from dropsical conditions, bruises, and similar conditions; that it would be efficacious to relieve asthma, pneumonia, and lung congestion, to treat stomach ulcers, colitis, gas, and other symptoms of indigestion, to correct constipation and diarrhea, and to relieve menstrual pains; that it would be efficacious to enable the user to sleep restfully, to fall asleep while still in pain, and to sleep through disturbances; that it would be efficacious to aid circulation and to relieve the pain of toothache, headache, arthritis, muscular aches, and other pain; that it would be efficacious to dissolve mineral deposits in the body such as occur in arthritis; and that it would be efficacious in the treatment of cancer and tuberculosis. The article would not be efficacious for the purposes represented and suggested.

DISPOSITION: December 9, 1947. Pleas of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed a single fine of \$250, together with costs.

2437. Misbranding of Cosmo-Light device. U. S. v. Fred Gerkey. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$500. (F. D. C. No. 24224. Sample No. 70813-H.)

INFORMATION FILED: March 31, 1948, Western District of Missouri, against Fred Gerkey, Mission, Kans.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about November 15, 1946, from the State of Missouri into the State of California.

PRODUCT: Examination disclosed that the device consisted essentially of a high-voltage transformer of the type used in neon signs, together with the wiring, and a series of tubes constructed like neon tubes. The tubes were connected with the terminals of the transformer in such manner that no current passed through the tubes directly, but so that a small amount of current flowed between closely adjacent tubes, causing a slight illumination. The close proximity of the tubes caused a corona discharge to take place between them. This discharge was responsible for the fizzing noise when the device was in operation and for the production of ozone.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the device, including a circular entitled "Facts-Color-Ozone" which was shipped prior to the device, and a leaflet entitled "Instructions" which was shipped with the device, were false and misleading since the device would not be efficacious for the purposes represented. The statements represented and suggested that the device would be efficacious in healing and preventing disease and in the treatment of polio, sprained wrist, bladder trouble, prostate ailments, colitis, lung trouble, pain in leg, blindness, arthritis, paralysis, asthma, every kind of condition, and sinus trouble.

DISPOSITION: May 14, 1948. A plea of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$500.